**Hawke Institute Working Paper Series**
**No 15**

# INTERPRETING GLOBALISATION USING TAYLOR'S COMMUNITARIAN-REPUBLICAN MODEL

Glen Lehman

Hawke Institute,
University of South Australia
Magill, South Australia
2001

The Hawke Institute
University of South Australia
St Bernards Road
Magill
South Australia 5072
Australia
www.hawkecentre.unisa.edu.au/institute

ISSN 1443-9298
ISBN 0 86803 814 8

# INTERPRETING GLOBALISATION USING TAYLOR'S COMMUNITARIAN-REPUBLICAN MODEL

Glen Lehman*

## INTRODUCTION

> Take gender equality. It is astonishing how recently the franchise was extended to women. In the 19th century, a great majority of both sexes concurred in the idea that this was the order of things. Today, these arguments are unrecoverable. Just as an argument held in some timeless empyrean, we can imagine people going either way, being convinced that women were different in some way which justified denying them the vote, or else being convinced to abandon this view. Again, as a movement in history, we can imagine a reversal; should the Taliban offensive ever reach Chicago, you'll see. (Taylor 1999b: 162).

This essay examines the ideology of liberalism that has supported the acceleration of global reform and analyses some of the reasons for the widespread dissatisfaction with neo-liberal globalisation. Arguments for globalisation have been matched with protests at meetings of international trade, financial and business organisations in Washington, Seattle, Melbourne, Prague and Genoa. The battles over globalisation have taken place within and outside the conference centres hosting the meetings. In important respects this process reflects the limited level of democratic interchange concerning the impact and effect globalisation has on the natural environment, local communities and nation-states (see Dryzek 1999; Gill 1995).

In the current era of globalisation and transnational corporatisation the trend toward 'economic' liberalisation and deregulation is overwhelming (see Johnson and Kaplan 1987; Held 1995; Peters and Waterman 1982; Stace 1997). Globalisation is driven by an ideology of efficient and effective management, which is assumed to harmonise relationships between corporations and nation-states. Many companies are now transnational and not located at fixed geographical sites, but are the result of alliances that permit intervention and registration as national companies in numerous locations. On the other hand, companies with fixed geographical locations have markets that are now increasingly vulnerable to international financial fluctuations. Domestic and international processes of

* Senior Research Fellow, School of Accounting and Information Systems, University of South Australia; formerly an Inaugural Hawke Institute Research Fellow.

organisational change rely on a liberal framework based on a separation between the private and public spheres of human activity. Thus, international liberal regimes analysis assumes that institutions of governance, such as the European Union and the multilateral trade and finance organisations, provide a structure that enables the benefits of globalisation to be realised by the world's citizens (see Bohman 1999). Yet critics of globalisation, such as Benjamin Barber (1995), argue that processes of globalisation are likely to lead to the 'McDonaldisation' of the world. The central issue to bear in mind is how political theory might help develop strategies to tame globalisation.

One way to explore globalisation is to consider its cultural and environmental effects using ideas from the liberal–communitarian debate. The most common starting point is Kant's procedural republican cosmopolitanism (see Habermas 1997). Yet Kantian proposals to tame globalisation often proceed without considering a communitarian critique of Kant's predilection for procedure which can obfuscate the limits of free-market globalisation and liberal reform (Brown 2000; Morrice 2000; Taylor 1998). More particularly, Charles Taylor's communitarian critique of contemporary procedural and Kantian forms of liberalism provides layers of meaning that enable us to understand the importance of identity. With the intensification of globalisation and the acceleration of market reforms throughout the world economy the politics of identity are becoming increasingly important (Taylor 1994).

Further, the relationships between free markets and liberal reform have the potential to submerge other ways to think about international relations and the role of the market (Barber 1995; Taylor 1998). This article shares these concerns and explores the relationships between free-market globalisation and procedural liberalism to consider whether people's freedom can be promoted in a free-market world economy. This is especially the case when multinational corporations gain the most from global free markets and informal, discretionary and spatially diverse modes of coordination. In this regard the impact of globalisation on local communities is considered through the ideal of authenticity using republican ideals central to the writings of both Kant and Taylor.

These issues are addressed in three sections. The article begins by considering the relationship between global corporations and free-market liberalism. The second considers Kantian solutions to create a peaceful and just global world order and introduces Taylor's communitarian perspective to consider how we might combine divergent values between and within nation-states (Taylor 1992a). It is argued that Kant's *Perpetual peace* (1957) sets in train arguments about the authentic life[1] and

1 Authenticity, a central Heideggerian concept, concerns itself with the parameters of a person's life and explores the deeper features of a person's being. It is closely associated with the notion of autonomy but involves the actor's deeper structures and beliefs, which may not be weighed or traded.

about the criteria of self-rule and individual self-realisation (cf Parker 1992; Schuerman 1999). The next section develops the useful implications of Kant's cosmopolitan republicanism to create a communitarian interpretation of globalisation (Beitz 1999). Finally, Taylor's communitarian framework for democratic governance, the ideal of authenticity and republican ideas are used to consider the effects of free-market globalisation (see also Hirst and Thomson 1996).

## GLOBALISATION AND THE IDEAL OF AUTHENTICITY: FREE-MARKET LIBERALISM

Proponents of globalisation have maintained that the aim of neo-liberal globalisation is to 'lock in' initiatives to secure investor freedoms and property rights for transnational global enterprises (Gill 1995; Gray 1998; Soros 1998). For example, the International Monetary Fund's (1997) report *World economic survey: globalisation: opportunities and challenges* exemplifies neo-liberal logic and its assumption that a market order leads to efficiency and a fair distribution of economic resources. This report observes:

> The discipline of global product and financial markets applies not only to policy-makers, via financial market pressures, but also to the private sector, making it more difficult to sustain unwarranted wage increases and mark-ups. If markets adopt too sanguine a view of a country's economic policies and prospects, however, this could relax policy disciplines for a time and result in a high adjustment cost when market perceptions change … [Then] markets will eventually exert their own discipline, in such a way that the time period for adjustment may be brutally shortened. (IMF 1997: 70–71)

Within the scholarly community, the work of Frederick Hayek provides the most influential argument that the intensification and integration of international capitalism is conducive to the rule of law and a peaceful world order (Hayek 1976). This perspective is based on the ontological assumption that liberal free-market individualism is the principal value governments should protect through free-market reforms. Proponents of free-market globalisation argue that these structures will stabilise relationships in the global world order, but recent global economic and financial problems illustrate the problematic implications of this claim. Put simply, are all citizens unambiguous beneficiaries of globalisation? This concern is not taken into consideration by advocates of what could be called absolute global reform, as advanced by the Secretary-General of the International Monetary Fund, David Johnston. He argues:

> This integration brought on by trade and investment is the basis of current prosperity and underpins rising living standards. But just as it drives improvements in productivity, such expansion can cause

> dislocation, impost adjustments on domestic economies and increase the vulnerability of economies to external shocks. Adjusting to the shocks requires that markets function effectively. The OECD has a role to play in this regard in the development of a 'global architecture' that will let markets function better, to the benefit of everyone. (Johnston 1998: 4)

This argument for globalisation rests on the ontological assumption that when citizens behave within the parameters of the free market adverse economic and political damage will be rectified. This assumption is based on the neo-liberal supposition that 'that government is best that governs the least'. As a result, it is assumed that relatively small, intimate, locally autonomous and self-governing communities governed by a cosmopolitan world government create the conditions for liberal 'perpetual peace'. Consider, for example, the arguments advanced by Ophuls and Boyan for a global world government:

> The need for a world government with enough coercive power over the fractious nation states to achieve what reasonable people would regard as the planetary common interest has become overwhelming … The clear danger is that, instead of promoting world cooperation, ecological scarcity will simply intensify the Hobbesian war of all against all—with the destruction of the common planet (for purposes of human habitation) the tragic outcome. (Ophuls and Boyan 1992: 255)

Ophuls and Boyan recall limits to growth literature and its critique of economic growth as a means of increasing wealth and providing funds to undertake ecological restoration projects and social reform. There are two problems with their argument for a steady-state community in a globalised world economy. The first is that people's freedoms are not given adequate consideration in steady-state societies and this *could* require more regulation and state intervention. Second, I argue that it is difficult to visualise how steady-state communities lead back to American-style Jeffersonian politics and minimal notions of the state to promote individual freedom. This is especially the case when global corporations are allowed to continue their operations with limited restrictions on their activities (see especially Schuermann 1999).

Advocates of free markets maintain that constitutional democratic principles actually endorse Jeffersonian-inspired liberal values to protect each person's liberty and to create tolerance in communities (Ophuls and Boyan 1992). They share Edmund Burke's perspective that tolerance is an important element in developing social capital in communities and argue that the best government is minimal (see Ophuls and Boyan 1992). The chief threat to global harmony, however, comes not simply from nation-states, but also from the forces of global capitalism and the market which propel more demand and desire in communities. Yet, proponents of free-market globalisation rarely consider questions of culture and identity, which have the potential to build nationalist aspirations and pressures for self-

determination. The challenge, then, is to create mechanisms of global governance to control and monitor organisations that affect the possibilities for interaction among spatially different actors, making political relationships more complex and not uniform. In effect, there is limited discussion about the democratic implications of global free-market reform. Advocates of free-market globalisation, then, focus on deregulating and privatising institutions of governance, but for reasons that are not related to the ideal of authenticity (Taylor 1992a).

## KANTIAN GLOBAL REPUBLICANISM AND AUTHENTICITY

The complexities of globalisation are reflected in the international dimensions of the relationships between and within nation-states. Discussions concerning the international relations dimensions of globalisation often begin with Kant's republicanism and his proposal for a cosmopolitan world order.[2] Most recent work developing republican ideals acknowledges a debt to the famous historian JGA Pocock. He explained how early republicanism grew out of a civic humanist tradition 'to realise a universality of values within a particular, and therefore finite and mortal, political structure' (Pocock 1975: 84).[3] The republican tradition is appealing because it selects the best among divided interests and distills a spirit of the common good, where that good is explored through practical reasoning, recognising the 'strong evaluations' that shape freedom in the context of local community relationships (Taylor 1991; 1998). To ignore what Taylor refers to as the background horizons of meaning is to run the risk of accentuating fragile ethnic tensions.

The usefulness of Kant's republicanism revolves around his perspective that the inevitable spread of the institutional and legal structures of a 'peaceable federation' will respect the basic rights of its citizens. Implicit in his republicanism is the argument that peace will spread throughout the global community when people are provided with opportunities to regard themselves as free and equal. In 'Perpetual peace', Kant argued:

> The peoples of the earth have … entered in varying degrees into a universal community, and it has developed to the point where a violation of laws in one part of the world is felt everywhere. The idea of a cosmopolitan law is therefore not fantastic and overstrained: it is a

2 Kant's arguments for perpetual peace advance his recommendations for a world republic in his 'On the common saying, "This may be true in theory but it does not apply in practice"' (Kant 1971b).

3 Republicanism has two essential and distinct characteristics for the purposes of understanding globalisation. First, in a republican society there is clear separation of powers between the legislature and the executive. Those who make the laws have to be different from those who carry them out. Second, the laws are made by the people's representatives.

> necessary complement to the unwritten code of political and international law, transforming into a universal law of humanity. (Kant 1971a: 107–108)

This passage reveals Kant's belief in the possibility of harmony and the solution of differences through a slowly spreading federation of internally peaceful republics. He insisted on the internal sovereignty of nations as a condition for preserving the freedom of each nation-state. He continued:

> [T]his federation does not aim to acquire any power like that of a state, but merely to preserve and secure the freedom of each state in itself … this idea of federalism extending gradually to encompass all states and thus leading to perpetual peace. (Kant 1971a: 102)

Kant assumed that cosmopolitan law would lead to the gradual extension and democratisation of relationships between nation-states (see Kant 1971a).[4] He argued that peace could become perpetual in one of two ways. First, perpetual peace is achieved 'where all the horrors of violence and those responsible for them would be buried' (Kant 1971a: 105, found in Bohman and Lutz-Bachmann 1997). Second, perpetual peace among nations would be enforced through a new form of cosmopolitan law, in which a world congress, or federation, implements the rule of law.

Notwithstanding the importance of Kant's work on cosmopolitanism,[5] what seems to have happened is that virtual organisations and transnationals avoid the global 'rule of law' and 'weak' local regulation by taking advantage of benefits given by local communities. The political conditions conducive to the creation of a cosmopolitan world order, however, have been scuttled by demands for greater financial and pecuniary return in a deregulated world order. Recent work on globalisation assumes that Kantian reforms can be extended to consider organisational reality and its impact on environmental and social processes of interaction. Underlying the Kantian approach is the assumption that each state respects the basic and fundamental rights of citizens. Kant argued:

> This rational idea of a *peaceful*, even if not friendly, thoroughgoing community of all nations on the earth that can come into relations

---

4 See Kant's developed view in his *Groundwork on the Metaphysics of Morals* (1949), especially pp 121–122.

5 Cosmopolitanism is a Kantian concept and deals with processes of liberalisation throughout the world. He advocates the implementation of universal human rights throughout the nations of the world, but as recent events illustrate it is problematic whether this is enough to create a peaceful world order. Taylor (1999b) argues that we must first come to terms with difference before we impose solutions within global civil societies.

> affecting one another is not a philanthropic (ethical) principle but a principle *having to do with rights*. Nature has enclosed them all together within determinate limits (by the spherical shape of the place they live in, a *globus terrqueus*). (Kant 1996: 121).

But, as Taylor has reminded us, many nation-states and their various cultures do not have the moral and physical structures to implement this transformation in their social relationships (Taylor 1992b). Understanding globalisation is not simply about developing a rights-based culture, but also concerns how we develop and understand the effects of globalisation on other cultures in a cosmopolitan world order.

Yet, despite the procedural limitations of Kant's republicanism his work on citizen self-rule and self-realisation sets us on a path through which we might begin to understand the necessity of combining different cultural goods (Taylor 1999b). While Kant believed that human communities will converge (which does not seem to be happening), what seems to be needed now is a means to explore how new levels of political and economic integration create better relationships between nation-states. In modifying Kant's work it is useful to follow Hegel's critique of Kantian cosmopolitanism, which begins with a different way to think about what it is to be a person living in actual historical and social contexts. Taylor reminds us that Hegel's work can be thought of as inviting us to explore the dimensions of 'being' and 'belonging' (Taylor 1975). Kantian and other procedural liberal models often fail in this regard because they often rely on free markets to create unambiguous economic improvements for everyone. Here, Charles Taylor's interpretation of Hegel's practical reasoning works toward a new way to think about the autonomy of the nation-state and its relation to the global level rather than the other way round (Taylor 1975; 1985; 1989). At present, global free-market reforms are applied at the level of the nation-state, with little consideration of the dialectical relationships between the nation-state and the global commons. Taylor's neo-Hegelian ideas are helpful here because he points out that dealing fairly with such issues includes 'recognition' of difference and diversity. Taylor states:

> The thesis is that our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. (Taylor 1992a: 25)

Following Taylor's interpretation of Hegel, people's identity must be considered before we begin the process of reconciliation. The Hegel-Taylor framework warns that focusing on strict and formal conditions for entry into global unions makes us oblivious to the effects on people's way of being in the world. A cosmopolitan solution to global social and environmental issues might actually make matters worse.

It might, therefore, be more realistic to work to create conditions and strategies to understand non-liberal and non-democratic regimes before we transform them through cosmopolitan political strategies (Taylor 1999b). This, then, takes us in a different direction to that of modern cosmopolitan liberals, such as John Rawls, who argued that we should tolerate different cultures in a global overlapping consensus (Rawls 1993; 1999). Cosmopolitan republicanism, on Rawls's formulation, offers only a conservative justification for illiberal cultural practices. A Hegelian and interpretive strategy, however, works to understand what globalisation is and how it affects cultural contexts and the differing ways that people live their lives before attempting to transform people's way of thinking and acting in the world.

**Kantian republicanism and Habermas' solution**

In the Kantian tradition, Jürgen Habermas has famously adapted the Hegelian and Kantian positions and applied this analysis to global world politics. He argues that it is possible to find an Archimedean point in the possibilities provided by language through which people communicate and develop stable moral and ethical principles. What Habermas finds attractive in Kant's argument for cosmopolitan and perpetual peace is its search for mechanisms of influence that can be developed through the rule of law (Habermas 1997: 113–155). Interestingly, he offers similar global solutions to David Held's proposal for wider powers for the United Nations and a liberalising world government (Held 1995; 1997). Habermas argues that Kant's proposals must be backed by the coercive and constitutional powers of an international court that understands violations of human rights as crimes against an enforceable cosmopolitan law. Habermas explains:

> The correct solution to the problem of the moralization of power politics is therefore 'not the demoralization of politics, but rather the democratic transformation of morality into a positive system of law with legal procedures of application and implementation'.[6] Fundamentalism about human rights is to be avoided not by giving up on the politics of human rights, but rather only through the cosmopolitan transformation of the state of nature among states into a legal order. (Habermas 1995: 149)

Here, Habermas argues that a strong moral stance is unlikely to solve international disputes and that we must construct a positive system of law. He advocates the rule of law through the construction of more procedures to guide decision making. He advances his idealised speech situation as a proxy for the type of structure that would create political avenues so that different people's values and beliefs are given adequate respect. I interpret Habermas as arguing that transforming people's cultural norms and values within his idealised model is the means to construct a

6 Habermas is quoting from Klaus Günther (1994: 144).

just society. The worry remains, however, that in the idealised speech situation people's beliefs and values are transformed in this process of role reversal. Thus, Habermas supports global cosmopolitanism when it liberalises the world according to the suppositions of western modernity. His Kantian search is to transform interlocutors into liberal citizens in a global free world order supported by a liberal rule of law. Of course, I am not arguing against the rule of law, but want to supplement it with a broader way of thinking about the democratic and political importance of culture and identity.

Taylor responds to Habermas and argues that the construction of more procedural rules and regulations actually severs humanity from their culture and way of being in the world. Taylor refers to the means to achieve collective enterprises, access to life goods and the good life as 'constitutive goods' which do more than just define the content of moral theory because they empower us to be good. The concept of globalisation through cosmopolitan transformation fails to consider what it is to be a 'person' living in global relationships (Taylor 1989: 93). While endorsing forms of liberal advocacy and global processes Taylor is dissatisfied with the structures, both physical and moral, in which they normally take place. This is because, according to communitarians, at the root of the contemporary problem is the liberal construction of the self (Taylor 1985). For example, Michael Sandel sees the liberal self as 'independent from the interests and attachments we may have at any moment, never identified by our aims but always capable of standing back to survey and assess and possibly to revise them' (Sandel 1982: 175).[7]

Only in a world empty of *telos*, or ultimate meaning, is it possible to think of the self as independent of any attachments. Clearly, though, instrumental reason limits the options available for defining the self as independent of communal affiliations and free to choose its own ends. In such a globalising world economy people become detached from their culture and nature, thereby accelerating ethnic tension and the oblivion of nature.

Habermas' support for Kantian cosmopolitanism, however, cuts interlocutors from the cultural contexts which shape how we think and act concerning issues of 'significance'. In particular, processes of globalisation and arguments for the cosmopolitan transformation of the world fail to consider the significance that people assign to their way of being in the world. In evaluating motivation, there are 'weak' and 'strong' approaches, argues Taylor:

> Whereas for the simple weigher what is at stake is the desirability of different consummations, those defined by his de facto desires, for the strong evaluator reflection also examines the different possible modes of being of the agent. Whereas a reflection about what we feel like more, which is all the simple weigher can do in assessing motivations,

7 Sandel is here referring to Rawls (1980: 515–572).

> keeps us as it were at the periphery; a reflection on the kind of beings we are takes us to the centre of our existence as agents ... It is in this sense deeper. (Taylor 1977: 47–48)

Because of its atomistic ontology, liberalism offers a 'weak' explanation of the motivations behind decisions.[8] Indeed, communication theorists and procedural liberals conceive of decision-making structures that ignore motivations and are intended to be neutral, but which invariably impact on 'significant' others. Communitarians, in this way, search for a more comprehensive grasp of the assumptions, ideas and values that frame different cultural, environmental and social frameworks in a global world economy. That understanding, Taylor insists, does not necessarily have to lead to specific advocacy proposals. Significance may or may not result in action. Nor need it contribute to a monolithic view of the common good, fixed for all time—a view, one might add, mistakenly attributed by some to Aristotle. Significant elements may form part of a potentially meaningful totality that contains lacunae or missing pieces of evidence to be reconstructed through historical inquiry. Those significant elements may be fluid, but they are not purely subjective elements to be approached in a relativistic manner. They may be ascertained, moreover, in hermeneutic fashion, in the same manner as text.

The communitarian search for the ideal of authenticity demands that we continue the liberal project that searches for common ground before we attempt to impose a liberal solution (Taylor 1992a). The traditional liberal division between state and civil society, however, does not provide the political space for each individual to make fully informed decisions concerning the direction of communities. Habermas's fusion of Hegel and Kant, then, overlooks the left Hegelian injunction toward social reconciliation through which the good emerges as the fruit of democratic debate and interchange (Taylor 1999b). A communitarian line of reasoning offers a sharp contrast to Habermas's proposal, which offer more formal modes of rational reconstruction (assuming that its rational choice methods hold). Habermas assumes that the 'other' agent will, under a formal ideal speech situation or categorical imperative, give up their own beliefs and values in the search for an overlapping consensus. The processes of global capitalism assume that cultures are malleable and can be manipulated by the instrumental procedures of a global republic.

Yet, a Hegelian communitarian correction recognises that controlling the impact of transnational corporations on local economies must involve not simply the institutionalisation of global regulation, but also the 'self-organizing process of mutual constitution of legal acts and legal structures' (Tuebner 1997: 13). In this way, a communitarian critique of procedural liberal-cosmopolitanism warns that imposing liberal values might actually accelerate ethnic tensions and differences.

---

8 Kymlicka (1991: 47–48) criticises communitarians for treating *all* liberals as if they adhered to an atomist conception of the human agent.

Thus, Habermas's remarkable fusion of Hegelian and Kantian values does not explicitly consider how harmonisation trends rely on corporations in free markets as a means to implement democratic reform. Habermas supports institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union as the ideal mechanisms to harmonise relationships between nation-states, thereby bringing states together through understanding and synthesis. One wonders whether citizens have access to the mechanisms of deliberation in liberal-democratic societies. One way to tame globalisation and its cosmopolitanism is to extend Habermas's procedural interpretation through a substantive republican structure that connects nation-states with global structures of governance. Taylor's framework, in this regard, calls for political insight to be distilled in the public sphere so that globalisation improves opportunities for all people. We need, therefore, to be attentive to the reasons why some corporations, for example, lobby for greater access to markets and then turn around and ask to be granted exemptions from aspects of the deregulation process.

## CRITICAL AND DEMOCRATIC DELIBERATION IN A GLOBAL REPUBLIC

I have argued to this point that an understanding of globalisation can benefit from the liberal-communitarian debate inspired by Charles Taylor's work on Hegel. It provides a means to assess the merits of liberal notions of a global world government and the powers it should have in creating the conditions for perpetual peace. This, then, provides a means to carefully explore the relationships between Hegelian and Kantian methods of political determination, allowing a response to be made to Morrice's argument:

> Communitarianism reminds us that individuals do not and cannot live full lives outside communities, and points to the antisocial consequences of atomistic individualism. Communitarianism also correctly questions the liberal notion of the neutral state. However, communitarianism threatens, or does not guarantee, individual rights and liberties, and poses the problem of moral relativism. (Morrice 2000: 246)

Morrice's concern with communitarian relativism requires a strong response. In fact, Taylor has consistently pointed out that it is within language that a rational consensus emerges and progress occurs through the force of the better argument. He argues that history has shown that human communities develop and moral progress occurs through historical development. Taylor (1999b) cites the suffragette movement as an example of moral improvement that has transposed our way of thinking about relationships and ways of being in the world. That is, democratic debate and human rights have now become so entrenched in our culture and have become a key component in our social imaginings (Taylor 1999b: 161). Put simply, Taylor asks us to consider how a broader 'practical reason' can help us engage with other cultures and their practices. Taylor's communitarian-

republicanism is about building bridges between cultures in respectful ways. In a way similar to that proposed by Gadamer (1975), it is through ever broader moral horizons we can begin to understand the different claims and strategies advanced by liberals and communitarians as they affect the possibilities for republican self-rule (Taylor 1999a; 1999b).

A global republic must, therefore, create political insight into the effects of globalisation, which can be brought about through complex patterns of social interaction rather than simply by processes of individuation, or strict collective structures (Taylor 1989; 1997; 1998). Libertarian writers, such as Hayek, advocate a diminished role for the state, consigning the possibilities for reform to an impoverished version of civil society.[9] Most communitarians, moreover, would agree with Jürgen Habermas (who is not usually considered to be a communitarian[10]), that we need a new public sphere through which people can have their say in collective concerns. This form of republicanism involves the development of a civic culture through which internal and external relationships between and within nation-states can be developed. These processes are developed relationally rather than through the construction of more procedures (see Taylor 1999b). Benjamin Barber has offered the following argument, which explains the importance of community interaction through civil society:

> It was only when individuals who thought of themselves as citizens began to see themselves as consumers, and groups that were regarded as voluntary associations were supplanted by corporations legitimized as 'legal persons', that market forces began to encroach on and crush civil society from the private sector side. Once markets began to expand radically, government responded with an aggressive campaign on behalf of the public weal against the new monopolies, inadvertently crushing civil society from the state side. Squeezed between the warring realms of the two expanding monopolies, statist and corporate, civil society lost its preeminent place in American life. By the time of the two Roosevelts it had nearly vanished and its civic denizens had been compelled to find sanctuary under the feudal tutelage of either big government (their protectors and social servants) or the private sector, where schools, churches, unions, foundations, and other associations could assume the identity of corporations and aspire to be no more than special interest groups formed for the particularistic ends of their members. (Barber 1995: 282–283)

---

9 'Civil society is defined as a sphere of social interaction between the economy and the state, comprising the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication' (Cohen and Arato 1992: ix).

10 While communitarians might agree with Habermas, many would see his approach as excessively procedural.

Moreover, in making the public sphere distinct and autonomous from any collectivist ontology, Barber is able to avoid liberal concerns that collective institutions impose illiberal positive freedom on citizens. Barber is concerned that globalisation affects the possibilities for debate and deliberation within and between communities. Communitarians in the Hegelian tradition, then, have explained the limitations of global civil society conceived along the lines of individual autonomy, which fail to recognise the common enterprises that shape people's way of being in the world (Taylor 1994; 1999b). This leads to awareness that the processes of global cosmopolitan capitalism pose three critical problems for democratic reform: first, the exposure of previously suppressed ethnic tensions; second, the need to solve the economic problem of scarcity; and third, the politics of identity in corporations is overlooked, which has a serious impact on the relationship between civil society, organisations and the state.

In responding to these problems, Taylor's solution to the malaise of modernity is to offer a different pathway where 'supersession' arguments provide a different means to liberalise cultures on their own terms. He proposes a different way to understand modernity and its processes of globalisation, showing that there may be a rational path from A to B, but not in the other direction (Taylor 1999b: 161). This process involves understanding that we have made ethically superior positions over the centuries (the vote for women and the provision of equality of pay). More particularly, Taylor's arguments point toward the supposition that a global republic developed along procedural liberal principles (cosmopolitanism) is insensitive to cultural differences and this is because it fails to work through moral dilemmas (Taylor 1999b). Habermasian and Kantian proposals do not offer a means to illustrate the historical processes involved in human progress and development (Taylor 1999b: 161–162). He states:

> So Kant's thesis that moral reasoning imposes on us the requirement of being able to universalize the maxims of our will, and Jurgen Habermas' discourse ethic is seen as binding on us in virtue of our being interlocutors who seek to convince each other ... Now this too doesn't seem to me to work. It may leave us without any way of backing our feeling that we have come to an ethically superior position in relation to our ancestors of 400 years ago, with reasons ... There is a way of proceeding, by what I have tried to call 'supersession arguments', where we show that there is a rational path from A to B, but not in the reverse direction. (Taylor 1999b: 161)

Within the methodology provided by supersession arguments lies the importance of moral theorising as a means to explore and understand difference. Taylor explains the importance of moral thinking thus:

> The original point of the doctrine was to combat a rival view, that knowing right and wrong was a matter of calculating consequences, in

> particular those concerned with divine reward and punishment. The notion was that understanding right and wrong was not a matter of dry calculation, but was anchored in our feelings. Morality has, in a sense, a voice within us. (Taylor 1995: 26)

Structures have developed in the global world order that do not take into account the collective ontological sources of the self. Here, Taylor is at one with most communitarians, among whom Alasdair MacIntyre is a trenchant critic of modernity.[11] For MacIntyre, the modern global citizen is a 'citizen of nowhere, an internal exile wherever he lives … modern liberal society can appear only as a collection of citizens of nowhere who have banded together for their common protection' (MacIntyre 1981: 156). Though not so pessimistic as MacIntyre, Taylor shares his dissatisfaction with representative democratic structures that submerge community enterprises within the free market and accelerating global reform. Those structures are shored up by a negative view of liberty that gives excessive weight to free markets and ignores the adverse effects of globalisation. Thus, modern global processes have the potential to make matters worse between cultures in a world of half-understood structural difference.

Furthermore, a common feature of communitarian thinking that is relevant to globalisation is its critique of libertarian attempts to solve social and environmental problems through individual private endeavour, which, it is argued, submerges recognition of collective goals (Taylor 1989: 509–510). The public sphere, endorsed by Taylor, lies within civil society and assists the democratic process. It consists of much more than free markets and involves citizens having their say in society's common affairs (Barber 1995). Such an enriched civil society would be informed by 'discourse ethics', according to which citizens combat the colonising force of instrumental reason and its narrow understanding of liberty.

Communitarian thought challenges advocates of globalisation to consider what liberty means to determine the extent to which nature shapes the possibilities for liberty. Through practical reasoning, 'significant features' of human identity (Taylor 1969: 281–301) may be explored. Humans do not exist prior to our understanding. We are constituted by it. As Taylor observes:

> [T]here is no adequate description of how it is with a human being in respect of his/her existence as a person which does not incorporate his/her understanding. We are partly constituted by our understanding. (Taylor 1983: 144)

Liberty, therefore, has meaning only in terms of social contexts and cannot be formed simply through free markets. Thus, practical reasoning is not just

---

11 Though MacIntyre does not consider himself to be a communitarian in any substantive way (see MacIntyre 1995).

procedural, but necessitates substantive relationships through which the good society can be discussed, contextualised and attained. In this way a communitarian-inspired global pathway works not simply through procedure, but to understand how the common good affects all citizens (Habermas 1996; Taylor 1989; 1998). Further, Habermas and Held do not consider the ability of capitalists to short-circuit global regulations and take advantage of localised benefits given to local communities. Here, Tuebner's (1997) argument that the 'mutual constitution' of legal acts within international economic law is dominated by global corporations is important. Therefore, a further limitation of Kantian reform is that it does not theorise the role of corporations and how they can avoid global rules and regulations. A global government, if there were to be one, then, must not only seek gradual and piecemeal change but begin to interpret and critically explore the effects of globalisation on different communities and cultures.

Thus, a global republican structure needs to explore whether corporations in a free market are the best means to create relationships between communities. What seems to have happened is that some nation-states have sought alliances with global organisations to avoid the universal implication of global free trade that corporations can move offshore at any time (see Schuermann 1999). The net effect has been to give more power to global corporations as agents of economic and political reform without political consideration of the social and environmental consequences. Part of any solution to the problems associated with globalisation, then, would be the development of interlocking mechanisms of governance to administer relationships between nation-states and global structures. That is, if a world government relies on the free market it does not possess the political mechanisms through which we distill and create the conditions for reciprocity and trust between nation-states.

Clearly, part of any global solution to governance issues involves considering the relationships between corporate culture, civil society and the state. Here, any future global republic must be attentive to critical theory and its emphasis on social inequality and ecological degradation, which are by-products of unregulated free-market capitalism. The challenge, again, is to extend Kant's recommendation for a slowly spreading co-federation of nation-states whilst remaining democratic and committed to protecting individual rights. It is, then, necessary to question whether corporate activity leads to unambiguous improvements in the life possibilities of citizens and local communities. While the impacts of transnational corporations are not uniform, they also are not linear in their effects on cultures and on the natural environment.

Understanding the adverse effects of globalisation must also involve a critical interpretation of how capitalism has transformed and regenerated itself (Taylor 1975: 555). One way to consider the institutional structures of globalisation is to create a critical focus on global capitalism. In this way differences between global

entities can be adjudicated and arbitrated (Held 1997: 248). In particular, Habermas and Held deny the usefulness of critical perspectives for exploring the global effects of class struggle and inequalities in wealth in particular cultural and environmental localities. Notably, Habermas has argued that Marx's dialectic and material conception of history is limited in that its focus is the economic sphere and it offers only a holistic conception of society. This leads to an instrumental understanding of revolution in which the proletariat are considered to be the historical macro-subjects of change. Habermas has explained:

> The Critique of the Gotha Programme tells us in no uncertain terms that Marx understood a communist society to be the only possible realisation of democracy. Here, as in his earlier critique of Hegel's doctrine of the state, freedom consists solely in 'converting the state from an organ superimposed on society into one thoroughly subordinate to it'. But [Marx] does not say any more about the way freedom would be institutionalised; he is unable to imagine institutional forms beyond the dictatorship of the proletariat that he predicted would be necessary during the period of transition. (Habermas 1991: 34–35)

According to Habermas, Marx's work is limited in that it undertheorises the mechanisms through which we communicate in public spheres. It, nevertheless, remains possible to locate points of intersection between the work of Habermas and critical theory. They both critically reflect on the ability of capitalism to deflect critique and reform proposals. In republican mode, different ideas are integrated into the polity by the people. This provides an opportunity to escape the restrictive epistemology of modernist metanarratives (Taylor 1999b). Dealing with global threats to identity and other adverse effects of capitalist modernity, then, requires new political equipment that takes seriously issues of identity and environmental belonging.

## CONCLUSION

Globalisation, then, requires us to explore what a community is and how communities might integrate 'strong evaluations' into the polity (Taylor 1991). Using a communitarian correction to procedural liberalism it becomes clearer that modern capitalism and competition pose stark threats to humanity because of the wasteful side effects of capitalism together with duplication and the need for new markets. A response to these problems is to explore how a global republic might be constructed and might avoid the impositional implications of liberal theory and its relationships with free-market ideology. There is a certain overlap between Kantian perpetual peace and free-market global processes. The latter require not only critique and more regulation, but the development of mechanisms of governance with justice and fairness. The strength of republicanism is that it explicitly seeks to distill different political arrangements between communities, organisations and nation-states. This strategy has the advantage of preserving the autonomy of

particular and local contexts while balancing how communities use and distribute economic resources, thereby determining the shape of and possibilities for people's freedoms.

In particular, the politics of globalisation concern the relationships between and continuity of dualisms such as individuals–collectives, nation-states–world governments, invisible hand–regulation and humanity–nature. Dominant organisational and procedural liberal theories tend to under-theorise these relationships, overlooking the dilemmas confronting modern communities and the global world order. Globalisation has impacted, and will continue to impact, on the sovereignty of nation-states. Managing the dialectical effects of globalisation requires the democratisation of organisational, community and national relationships, which works from the ground up to combat the adverse impacts of global capitalism. These two premises are based on a regime framework that reflects the assumptions of liberalism and capitalism. Strict individual liberalism supports the market providing the most efficient and effective global government, typically a minimalist one. One consequence of this has been moves to privatise and deregulate state functions. With the evaporation of the Cold War and the rise of modes of international government (the UN and EU), the opportunity has arisen to construct a global republic. This way of thinking about globalisation works from Kant's basic premises to consider whether the impacts of organisations on local communities and on the natural environment can be controlled. Discussions about the format of this global republic need to be encouraged across all levels of community. Habermas's work on discourse ethics is notable because it emphasises civil society as an arena where the network pattern of social interactions might play a larger role in informing communities of adverse corporate impacts. Managing globalisation, then, involves constructing from the ground up political (*local*) institutions that traverse the boundaries of the nation-state, rather than imposing a homogenous (*universal*) world government over nation-states.

Addressing problems between nation-states involves not only extending democracy to the global level, but also considering what it means to be a person and how culture impacts on identities, both in organisations and in communities (Taylor 1989). Managing the more damaging effects of globalisation requires determining the extent to which free-market reforms can achieve their stated goals and objectives, and whether democratisation of civil society and the state can be achieved in a global context.

## REFERENCES

Beitz, C 1999 'Social and cosmopolitan liberalism', *International Affairs,* vol 75, no 3, pp 515–529.

Barber, B 1995, *Jihad vs McWorld,* Ballantine Books, New York.

Bohman, J 1999, 'On decentralisation and the principles of democracy', *International Affairs*, vol 75, no 3, pp 499–515.

Bohman, J and ML Lutz-Bachmann (eds) 1997, *Perpetual peace: articles on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Brown, C 2000 'Cultural diversity and international political theory: from the *Requirement* to "mutual respect"', *Review of International Studies,* vol 26, no 2, pp 199–215.

Cohen, J and A Arato 1992, *Civil society and political theory*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Dryzek, J 1999 'Transnational democracy', *Journal of Political Philosophy,* vol 7, no 1, pp 30–51.

Gadamer, HG 1975, *Truth and method* (trans G Barden and J Cummings), Sheed and Ward Ltd, London.

Gill, S 1995, 'Globalisation, market civilisation, and disciplinary neo-liberalism', *Millenium,* no 24, pp 399–423.

Gray, J 1998, *False dawn: the delusions of global capitalism*, Granta Books, London.

Günther, K 1994, 'Kampf gegen das Bose? Wider die ethische Aufrustung der Kriminalpolitik', *Kritische Justiz*, vol 17.

Habermas, J 1991, 'What does socialism mean today? The revolutions of recuperation and the need for new thinking' in R Blackburn (ed), *After the fall: the failure of communism and the future of socialism*, Verso, London, pp 25–47.

Habermas, J 1995, 'Reconciliation through the public use of reason: remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism', *Journal of Philosophy,* vol 92, no 3, pp 109–131.

Habermas, J 1996, *Between facts and norms,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Habermas, J 1997, 'Kant's idea of perpetual peace with the benefit of two hundred years' hindsight' in J Bohman and ML Lutz-Bachmann (eds), *Perpetual peace: articles on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 113–155.

Hayek, F 1976, *The road to serfdom,* Routledge, London.

Held, D 1995, *Democracy and the global order: from the modern state to cosmopolitan democracy*, Polity, London.

Held, D, 1997, 'Cosmopolitan democracy and the global order: a new agenda' in J Bohman and ML Lutz-Bachmann (eds), *Perpetual peace: articles on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, pp 235–253.

Hirst, P and G Thomson 1996, *Globalisation in question,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

IMF 1997, *World economic survey: globalisation: opportunities and challenges*, International Monetary Fund, Washington DC.

Johnson, HT and RS Kaplan 1987, *Relevance lost: the rise and fall of management accounting,* Harvard Business School Press, Harvard.

Johnston, DJ 1998, 'Securing the benefits of trade and investment', *OECD Observer,* no 211, pp 4–7.

Kant, I 1957, *Perpetual peace* (trans LW Beck), Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, Indianapolis.

Kant, I 1949, *Groundwork on the metaphysics of morals* (trans HJ Paton), Hutchinson, London. (Originally *The moral law.*)

Kant, I 1971a, 'Perpetual peace: a philosophical sketch' in H Reiss (ed), *Kant's political writings,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 93–125.

Kant, I 1971b, 'On the common saying, "This may be true in theory but it does not apply in practice"' in H Reiss (ed), *Kant's political writings,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 54–87. (This article is often referred to as 'Theory and practice'.)

Kant, I 1996, *The metaphysics of morals,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kymlicka, W 1991*, Liberalism, community and culture*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

MacIntyre, A 1981, *After virtue*, Duckworth, London.

MacIntyre, A 1995, 'The spectre of communitarianism', *Radical Philosophy,* vol 70, p 35.

Morrice, D 2000, 'The liberal-communitarian debate in contemporary political philosophy and its significance for international relations', *Review of International Studies,* vol 26, no 2, pp 233–251.

Ophuls, W and S Boyan, Jr 1992, *Ecology and the politics of scarcity revisited: the unravelling of the American dream*, Freeman and Co, San Francisco.

Parker, M 1992, 'Postmodern organisations or postmodern organisational theory', *Organization Studies,* vol 13, no 1, pp 1–17.

Peters, T and R Waterman 1982, *In search of excellence: lessons from America's best-run companies,* Harper and Rowe, New York.

Pocock, JGA 1975, *The Machiavellian moment: Florentine political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rawls, J 1980, 'Kantian constructivism in moral theory', *Journal of Philosophy,* vol 77, no 9, pp 515–572.

Rawls, J 1993, 'The laws of people' in S Shute and S Hurley (eds), *On human rights*, Basic Books, New York, pp 41–82.

Rawls, J 1999 *The law of peoples,* Harvard University Press, Harvard.

Sandel, M 1982 *Liberalism and the limits of justice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schuerman, WE 1999 'Economic globalization and the rule of law', *Constellations,* vol 6, no 1, pp 3–25.

Soros, G 1998, *The crisis of global capitalism,* Little, Brown and Co, London.

Stace, D 1997, *Reaching out from down under: building competence for global markets*, McGraw-Hill, Sydney.

Taylor, C 1969, 'Responsibility for self' in AO Rorty (ed), *The identities of persons,* University of California Press, California, pp 281–301.

Taylor, C 1975, *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Taylor, C 1977, 'What is human agency?' in T Mischel (ed), *The self: psychological and philosophical issues,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 114–115.

Taylor, C 1983, 'The significance of significance: the case of cognitive psychology' in S Mitchell and M Rosen (eds), *The need for interpretation: contemporary conceptions of the philosopher's task,* Athlone Press, London, pp 141–169.

Taylor, C 1985, 'Alternative futures: legitimacy, identity and alienation in late-twentieth century Canada' in A Cairns and C Williams, *Constitutionalism, citizenship and society in Canada,* University of Toronto Press, Toronto, pp 183–229.

Taylor, C 1989, *Sources of the self*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Taylor, C 1991, 'The dialogical self' in DR Hiley, JF Bohman and R Shusterman (eds), *The interpretive turn,* Cornell Press, Ithaca, pp 304–315.

Taylor, C 1992a, *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition* (ed A Gutmann), Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Taylor, C 1992b, *The ethics of authenticity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Taylor, C 1994 *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition: examining the politics of recognition*, (ed A Gutmann) (expanded edition of *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition,* 1992), Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Taylor, C 1995, *Philosophical arguments*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Taylor, C 1997, 'Nationalism and modernity' in R McKim and J McMahan (eds), *The morality of nationalism,* Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, pp 31–56.

Taylor, C 1998, 'The dynamics of democratic exclusion', *Journal of Democracy,* vol 9, no 4, pp 143–156.

Taylor, C 1999a, 'Concluding reflections and comments' in JL Heft (ed), *A Catholic modernity?: Charles Taylor's Marianist award lecture,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 105–127.

Taylor, C 1999b, 'Comment on Jurgen Habermas' "From Kant to Hegel and back again"', *European Journal of Philosophy,* vol 7, no 2, pp 158–160.

Tuebner, G 1997, '"Global bukowina": legal pluralism in the world society' in G Tuebner (ed), *Global law without a global state,* Aldershot, Dartmouth, pp 3–35.

## HAWKE INSTITUTE WORKING PAPER SERIES

No 1 Marjorie Griffin Cohen, *The World Trade Organisation and post-secondary education: implications for the public system in Australia*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 800 8

No 2 Claire Woods, *Communication and writing: footprints on a territory*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 801 6

No 3 Rhonda Sharp, *The economics and politics of auditing government budgets for their gender impacts*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 802 4

No 4 Anne Hawke, *Measuring the impact of gambling: an economist's view*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 803 2

No 5 Debra King, *Stakeholders and spin doctors: the politicisation of corporate reputations*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 804 0

No 6 Lois Bryson and Alison Mackinnon, *Population, gender and reproductive choice: the motherhood questions: directions for policy*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 805 9

No 7 Margaret Brown, Justin Beilby and Eric Gargett, *Participating in end-of-life decisions: the role of general practitioners*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 806 7

No 8 Nicholas Procter, *The local-global nexus and mental health of transnational communities*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 807 5

No 9 Rick Sarre, Meredith Doig and Brenton Fiedler, *Using the principles of corporate social responsibility in the process of risk management and accountability*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 808 3

No 10 Wendy Seymour, *The technological promise: enhancing social participation and citizenship for people with disabilities,* 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 809 1

No 11 Gerald McBride, *Adelaide's recipe for life: wisdom of the Kaurna*, 2000.
ISBN 0 86803 810 5

No 12 Ed Carson and Ben Wadham, *Regional devolution, contractualism and the corporate citizen*, 2001.
ISBN 0 86803 811 3

No 13 Howard Harris, *Making business ethics a competitive advantage*, 2001.
ISBN 0 86803 812 1

No 14 Rohana Ariffin, *Domestic work and servitude in Malaysia*, 2001.
ISBN 0 86803 813 X

No 15 Glen Lehman, *Interpreting globalisation using Taylor's communitarian-republican model*, 2001.
ISBN 0 86803 814 8

No 16 Mbulelo Vizikhungo Mzamane, *Where there is no vision the people perish: reflections on the African renaissance*, 2001.
ISBN 0 86803 815 6

Available from: Kate Leeson, Editor,
The Hawke Institute
University of South Australia
St Bernards Road
Magill
South Australia 5072
Australia

Telephone +61 8 8302 4371
Facsimile +61 8 8302 4776
Email: katherine.leeson@unisa.edu.au

www.hawkecentre.unisa.edu.au/institute

## THE HAWKE INSTITUTE

The Hawke Institute undertakes research and fosters debate on democratic participation in political, economic and social life.

The central themes of the Hawke Institute's work are

- the social, cultural and economic aspects of globalisation and its sustainability;
- issues of participation, equity and citizenship in working life, in education and in society; and
- questions of identity, of cultural production and representation, and of our place in the international community and specifically in Asia.

The Hawke Institute hosts seminar series, conferences and public lectures. It offers Hawke Research Fellowships, visiting fellowships and scholarships, and supports the work of sixteen affiliated research centres and groups. For details of the affiliated research centres and groups see the Hawke Institute website: www.hawkecentre.unisa.edu.au/institute. As well as promoting research on a local and national level, the institute has strong international links. It is the research arm of the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre.

Hawke Institute Director: Professor Alison Mackinnon
Telephone +61 8 8302 4370
Facsimile +61 8 8302 4776
Email alison.mackinnon@unisa.edu.au

Hawke Centre Director: Ms Elizabeth Ho
Telephone +61 8 8302 0371
Facsimile +61 8 8302 0420
Email hawke.centre@unisa.edu.au